Remarks

This REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION and REPLY is in response to the Office Action mailed August 19, 2009.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed August 19, 2009, Claims 1-15, 17, 24-27, 29-60, 63 and 64 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 52-53 were rejected 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yano et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0184546, hereinafter Yano). Claims 1-15, 17, 29-51 and 54-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano in view of Hailpern et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,383,299, hereinafter Hailpern) and further in view of Chua et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0049756, hereinafter Chua). Claims 24-27 and 63-64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano, Hailpern and Chua, and further in view of Vora et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,539,379, hereinafter Vora).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 24, 29, 32, 33, 36, 37, 52-54 and 63-64, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-15, 17, 24-27 and 29-60 and 63-64.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

In the Office Action mailed August 19, 2009, Claims 52-53 were rejected 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yano (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0184546).

Claim 52

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claim 52 for at least the reasons provided below. To more clearly recite the embodiment therein, Claim 52 has also been amended to recite:

> *52. (Currently Amended) A system for suggesting data as a response to client requests, comprising:*
>
> *a server configured to receive requests from a plurality of clients for content;*
>
> *an interface to a plurality of databases or data sources of content information coupled to said server;*
>
> *a communication protocol that provides a session connection between a client and the server, and allows the client to provide a user interface for input of queries, and to send, as part of the same session, a plurality of queries from a user to query the server for content,*

wherein each one of the plurality of queries are consecutive and together form an increasingly focused query string for retrieving content from the server, and

wherein each subsequent one of the plurality of queries extends the query string in the user interface by one or more additional characters; and

wherein said server

receives each subsequent one of the plurality of queries while it is being entered into the user interface,

applies the increasingly focused query string against the plurality of databases or data sources as it is being extended, and

while the user is entering the one or more additional characters, suggests a set of increasingly appropriate content or search criteria from the plurality of databases, to the client, for further use by the client within the same session.

Yano appears to disclose a document information management system in which a search-engine-compatible interface unit makes a word in a document displayed on the screen to be specified, transfers the specified word to a search engine as a keyword to be used in the search engine, receives a search result from the search engine, and displays the search result on the screen, while a browser-compatible interface unit performs a search (a keyword search and/or global search) by using the keyword transferred from a browser and transfers a search result to the browser. (Abstract). As disclosed by way of example therein, the browser 102 displays a document on the screen (S701). When a character is identified (specified), the search-engine-compatible interface unit 104 cuts out a character string obtained by adding some characters before and after the character thereto (adjacent character string) (S703), compares the cut-out character string to the word table (S704), cuts out the character string coincident with any word in the word table as a word, and identifies the word (S705). (Paragraphs [0075]-[0085]).

In the Office Action, it was asserted that Yano, at paragraphs [0079]-[0083], teaches a user entering each character of the keyword into the search engine, and that the system performs a search for the keyword as each character is entered, and hence discloses a plurality of consecutive queries.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that, in Yano, the query preparation steps appear to be performed at the browser, and particularly at the search-engine-compatible interface unit of the browser. For example, Yano, appears to describe a "concrete example of processing in steps S702 to S705". (Paragraph [0076]). When a character is identified (specified) through a mouse operation of the terminal unit 202 (S702), the search-engine-compatible interface unit 104 cuts out a character string obtained by adding some characters before and after the character thereto (adjacent character string) (S703), compares the cut-out character string to the word table (S704),

cuts out the character string coincident with any word in the word table as a word, and identifies the word (S705). (Paragraph [0075]). It appears that only then is the identified word recognized as a keyword and transferred to the search engine, (e.g. The identified word "MARK" is recognized as a keyword in step S706 of FIG. 7, and the keyword is transferred to the search engine 103. (Paragraph [0075]).

The above example appears to indicate that, in Yano, the adding of characters, and the comparison of words coinciding with a temporary word is performed by searching a word table at the browser. When it is determined that there is a coinciding word in the word table, the temporary word is identified as a keyword, and only then transferred from the browser to the search engine.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Yano does not appear to describe a user entering each character of the keyword into the search engine and the system performing a search for the keyword as each character is entered, as asserted by the Office Action.

To more clearly recite the embodiment therein, Claim 52 has been amended to recite that the system comprises a communication protocol that provides a session connection between a client and the server, and allows the client to provide a user interface for input of queries, and to send, as part of the same session, a plurality of queries from a user to query the server for content, wherein each one of the plurality of queries are consecutive and together form an increasingly focused query string for retrieving content from the server; wherein each subsequent one of the plurality of queries extends the query string in the user interface by one or more additional characters; and wherein the server receives each subsequent one of the plurality of queries while it is being entered into the user interface, applies the increasingly focused query string against the plurality of databases or data sources as it is being extended, and while the user is entering the one or more additional characters, suggests a set of increasingly appropriate content or search criteria from the plurality of databases, to the client, for further use by the client within the same session.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 52, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, when considered alone or in combination. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 53

Claim 53 has been amended similarly to Claim 52. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 52, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 53, as amended, is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

In the Office Action mailed August 19, 2009, Claims 1-15, 17, 29-51 and 54-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0184546) in view of Hailpern (U.S. Patent No. 7,383,299) and further in view of Chua (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0049756). Claims 24-27 and 63-64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano, Hailpern and Chua, and further in view of Vora (U.S. Patent No. 6,539,379).

Claim 1

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claim 52 for at least the reasons provided below. To more clearly recite the embodiment therein, Claim 52 has also been amended to recite:

1. (Currently Amended) A system for retrieval at a client system of content from a server system, comprising:

a communication protocol that enables an asynchronous connection over a network between a client system and a server system, and allows the client system to send via the network, and within a session between the client system and the server system, a lengthening string composed of a plurality of consecutively input characters, to query the server system for string-based content, while asynchronously receiving consecutive responses from the server as the characters are being input;

a client object, in communication with a client software at the client system and with the communication protocol, wherein the client object

receives, as input, consecutive additional characters from the client software, and

while each of the consecutive additional characters are being received as input, transmits via the network to a server object at the server system one or more corresponding consecutive queries, within the session between the client system and the server system, to retrieve content from the server system,

wherein each of the consecutive queries lengthens the string by the additional characters, to form a lengthening string for retrieving matching content from the server system; and

a server object, in communication with the server system, and with the client object via the communication protocol, wherein the server object

in response to receiving each of the consecutive queries that modify the lengthening string,

automatically uses the modified lengthening string to query and retrieve content information from the server system that matches the modified lengthening string, and

> *asynchronously returns, while the additional characters are being input and the consecutive queries are being transmitted and the lengthening string is being modified during the session, consecutive responses containing content information which increasingly matches the modified lengthening string, to the client object for immediate use by the client system.*

As described above, in Yano, the query preparation steps appear to be performed at the browser, and only then is the keyword transferred from the browser to the search engine. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Yano does not appear to describe a user entering each character of the keyword into the search engine and the system performing a search for the keyword as each character is entered.

Hailpern apparently discloses a method for searching for a partially specified Uniform Resource Locator (URL) addresses includes receiving a user request, from a user, including a partially specified URL address. A URL search request handler is invoked to search for the partially specified URL address within an inverted index of web site URLs. A web search request handler is invoked to rank the search results of the search for the partially specified URL address based on one or more keywords specified in the user request, a list of recently accessed URLs, and a user profile. (Abstract).

Chua apparently discloses a system and method for searching multiple disparate search engines. As disclosed therein, when a client executes a query, the search engine manager calls each wrapper registered to handle queries for participating search engines. The wrappers may be called to execute their respective searches asynchronously in parallel. Optionally, the client may enable or disable particular registered search engines. The search results of each search engine may be returned as the searches are completed. (Paragraph [0008]). When initiated by a client, a query is transmitted to the search engines in series, the search engines execute the query in parallel, and the results are returned asynchronously to the client. (Abstract).

In the Office Action, it was asserted that one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Hailpern's session between the client and server systems in Yano, in order to return to the user a list of URL addresses based on the search for the partially specified URL address; that the use and advantage of asynchronously receiving consecutive responses is well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art as evidenced by Chua; and that one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to incorporate or implement Chua's asynchronously returning responses in Yano's system providing the client with search results.

Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion. Although Chua appears to indicate that, when initiated by a client, "a query is transmitted to the search engines in series, the search engines execute the query in parallel, and the results are returned asynchronously to the client",

Chua also appears to describe that the search engine manager calls each wrapper registered to handle queries for participating search engines, and that the wrappers may be called to execute their respective searches asynchronously in parallel. Figures 5 and 6 of Chua similarly appear to indicate that the client is not involved in the asynchronous receiving of results from the several search engines; rather, it appears that only after a complete query is received from the client (e.g. step 530) is the query passed to each registered search engine; and only after all of the responses are received at the search engine manager (e.g. step 660) are the results communicated back to the client.

As such, it appears that the asynchronous feature referred to by Chua provides that a query, once received at the search engines, can be processed in parallel, and the search results of each search engine returned as those searches are completed (i.e. not necessarily in the order in which they were initiated). However, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Yano, Hailpern, nor Chua appear to describe an asynchronous session based connection between a client system and a server system in which the client can asynchronously receive consecutive responses from the server, as characters are being input, as recited by Claim 1.

To more clearly recite the embodiment therein, Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the client object receives, as input, consecutive additional characters from the client software, and while each of the consecutive additional characters are being received as input, transmits via the network to a server object at the server system one or more corresponding consecutive queries, within the session between the client system and the server system, to retrieve content from the server system, wherein each of the consecutive queries lengthens the string by the additional characters, to form a lengthening string for retrieving matching content from the server system. Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that the server object, in response to receiving each of the consecutive queries that modify the lengthening string, automatically uses the modified lengthening string to query and retrieve content information from the server system that matches the modified lengthening string, and asynchronously returns, while the additional characters are being input and the consecutive queries are being transmitted and the lengthening string is being modified during the session, consecutive responses containing content information which increasingly matches the modified lengthening string, to the client object for immediate use by the client system. Applicant respectfully submits that these features are neither disclosed by, nor obvious in view of Yano, Hailpern and/or Chua.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, when considered alone or in combination. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 24, 29, 32, 33, 36, 37, 54 and 63-64

The remarks provided above with regard to Claim 1 are herein incorporated by reference. Claims 24, 29, 32, 33, 36, 37, 54 and 63-64 have been similarly amended as shown above. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 24, 29, 32, 33, 36, 37, 54 and 63-64 are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-15, 17, 25-27, 30-31, 34-35, 38-51 and 55-60

Claims 2-15, 17, 25-27, 30-31, 34-35, 38-51 and 55-60 depend from and include all of the features of one of Claims 1, 24, 29, 32, 33, 36, 37 or 52-54. Claims 2-15, 17, 25-27, 30-31, 34-35, 38-51 and 55-60 are not addressed separately herein. However, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the remarks provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 19, 2010

By: /Karl Kenna/
Karl Kenna
Reg. No. 45,445

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800